

Serial No. 10/605,734
Filed: 10/22/2003
Page 6 of 8

Examiner: David L. Sorkin
Group Art Unit: 1723

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-22 were in the application as filed. The Examiner has allowed claims 12-22, and has indicated that claims 3-9 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of the rejected base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 2, and 10 stand rejected. Claim 1 has been amended in this paper to clarify that the non-rotation mounting called for in claim 1 is located in the interior of the second cylinder. No other amendments have been made, the aforementioned amendment of claim 1 being sufficient to overcome the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 10

No new matter has been added by the foregoing amendment, full support therefor being shown in the drawings and specification as filed. All claims remaining in the application are believed to now be in condition for allowance.

Further examination and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,431,078 to Kambara. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention is not anticipated under §102 unless each and every element of the claimed invention is found in the prior art. *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 231 USPQ 81, 90 (Fed. Cir. 1986). To anticipate, a single reference must teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. *Eolas Technologies Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 399 F.3d 1325, 1335; 73 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1782 (Fed. Cir. 2005). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Serial No. 10/605,734
Filed: 10/22/2003
Page 7 of 8

Examiner: David L. Sorkin
Group Art Unit: 1723

Amended claim 1 calls for a hydraulic actuator assembly comprising a first hydraulic actuator having a first cylinder with a first longitudinal axis, and a first piston slidable within the cylinder and attached to a first piston rod for movement along the first longitudinal axis with respect to the cylinder, a second hydraulic actuator having a second cylinder with a second longitudinal axis, a second piston slidable in the second cylinder and attached to a second piston rod for movement along the second longitudinal axis with respect to the second cylinder, and a non-rotation mounting located in the interior of the second cylinder between the second piston rod and the second cylinder for non-rotational movement of the second piston rod about the second longitudinal axis, and a rigid mounting between the first cylinder and the second cylinder so that the first longitudinal axis is parallel to the second longitudinal axis, and the first piston rod and the second piston rod are movable in opposite directions. Claims 2 and 10 depend from claim 1.

Kambara '078 discloses four symmetrically disposed piston-cylinder assemblies arranged in opposed pairs, each pair of similarly disposed piston rods being interconnected. The interconnection of the piston rods has the effect of preventing relative rotation of one piston in a pair from the other. The interconnection is external of the cylinders.

Amended claim 1 requires that the non-rotation mounting be located in the interior of the cylinder. The assemblies disclosed in Kambara '078 do not have a non-rotation mounting located in the interior of any of the cylinders. Each and every element of amended claim 1 is not found in Kambara '078. Thus, amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Kambara '078. Because claims 2 and 10 depend from amended claim 1, they are for the same reasons not anticipated by Kambara '078. Applicant requests of withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 10, and the allowance of claims 1, 2, and 10.

Because claims 3-9 and 11 also depend from amended claim 1, these claims are likewise not anticipated by Kambara '078, and are no longer objectionable as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Thus, Applicant requests withdrawal of the objection to claims 3-9 and 11, and the allowance of claims 3-9 and 11.

Serial No. 10/605,734
Filed: 10/22/2003
Page 8 of 8

Examiner: David L. Sorkin
Group Art Unit: 1723

CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, all claims in the application are allowable over the prior art. Early notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

If there are any outstanding issues which the Examiner feels may be resolved by way of telephone conference, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned to resolve these issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE A. HELDER

Dated: November 7, 2005

By: 

John E. McGarry, Reg. No. 22,360
Michael F. Kelly, Reg. No. 50,859
McGarry Bair PC
171 Monroe Avenue, N.W., Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
(616) 742-3500

G0195437.DOC